

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-11, 14-35 and 37 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 16, 22 and 31-35 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, specifically at paragraph [0137].

Changes to the claims are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

### **II. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT**

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, support of the amendment can be found at paragraph [0137] of the Specification, which is reproduced as follows:

[0137] Further, the embodiment described above has dealt with the case where the CM provided by a CM sponsor who contracts in advertisement with a program displayed at each guide column constituting the program guide area A<sub>1</sub> is selectively displayed in the CM display area A<sub>3</sub> on the EPG screen M<sub>1</sub>. However, this invention is not only limited to this, but a plurality of CMs can be

successively displayed for a single program. Similarly, a plurality of CMs for a single program can be successively displayed in the CM display area B<sub>1</sub> of the program details screen M<sub>2</sub> and the CM display area C<sub>1</sub> of the operation screen M<sub>3</sub>.

### III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-11 and 14-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394 to Schein et al. (herein after, “Schein) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724 to Sampat et al. (hereinafter, merely “Sampat”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,892,535 to Allen et al. (hereinafter, merely “Allen”).

Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Schein in view of Sampat and further in view of Allen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,554 to Hendricks et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hendricks”).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

**...wherein a plurality of commercials are successively displayed on a same program guide screen that displays program details for a single program.** (emphasis added)

Applicant submits that Schein, Sampat, Allen, and Hendricks, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or render predictable the above-identified feature of claim 1. Specifically, nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action discloses or renders predictable **“wherein a plurality of commercials are successively displayed on a same program guide screen that displays program details for a single program,”** as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action (see page 5) concedes that Schein and Sampat fail to disclose the above-identified features of claim 1 and relies on Figures 18 and 19 and Column 32, lines 46-62 of Allen for the rejection. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited portion of Allen displays advertisement during a broadcasting of a program. Nothing in Allen discloses or renders predictable to displays a plurality of commercials in a program guide screen. Moreover, nothing in Allen discloses or renders predictable to display a plurality commercials on a same program guide screen that displays program details of a single program.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Allen fails to disclose or render predictable **“wherein a plurality of commercials are successively displayed on a same program guide screen that displays program details for a single program,”** as recited in claim 1

For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is patentable over the Schein reference.

Applicant believes independent claims 6, 16, 22 and 32-35 are allowable for substantially the same reason as claims 1.

As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

#### **IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein and in view of Sampat and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,554 to Hendricks et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hendricks”)

Claim 37 depends from claim 34 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Hendricks does not add the elements missing from Schein and Sampat.

## **V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

## **CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our  
Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

By:   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800